

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The following remarks are presented for the Examiner's review.

Interviews were conducted by the Examiner, Jeffrie R. Lund, and counsel for the Applicants, Seongyoune Kang, on August 13, 2009 and August 17, 2009.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to recite "at least two sizes of wafer" and "in a ring-like manner" as discussed in the interview. An agreement had been reached that these claim amendments would overcome the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 112. Thus, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-6 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,526) in view of Barnes (U.S. Patent No. 5,670,066), Ito (U.S. Patent No. 6,815,646), Zhao (U.S. Patent No. 5,589,003) and Mulligan (U.S. Patent No. 6,164,633).

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite that "the surface of the second insulating area extends to a peripheral edge of the mounting face", that "the first area and the first insulating area directly support the small wafer mounted on the insulating sheet", and that "the first area, the first insulating area, the second area, and the second insulating area directly support the large wafer mounted on the insulating sheet". Independent claim 9 is similarly amended. An agreement had been reached during the interview of August 13, 2009 that these amendments would overcome this ground of rejection. Therefore, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Appl. No.: 10/561,421
Amendment Filed October 28, 2009
Reply to Office action dated August 21, 2009

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Barnes, Ito, Zhao and Mulligan as applied to claims 1-6 and 9-13 above, and further in view of Garabedian (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0179246) and Sago (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0198005).

The ground of rejection is also overcome due to the dependencies of claims 7-8 from claim 1. Thus, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwai (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0050496) in view of Zhao and Mulligan. Moreover, claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwai in view of Zhao and Mulligan as applied to claims 1-6 and 9-13 above, and further in view of Garabedian and Sago.

As recommended by the Examiner on August 17, 2009, a certified copy of JP 2003-278076 and an English translation thereof are filed in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.55 in order to perfect the claim to priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The foreign filing date of July 23, 2003 antedates the Iwai reference whose Japanese counterpart was published on February 19, 2004.

Since the claim to priority is perfected, Iwai is not prior art and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No.: 10/561,421
Amendment Filed October 28, 2009
Reply to Office action dated August 21, 2009

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-39102.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:



Seongyoune Kang – Reg. No. L0391

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: October 28, 2009